

January 12, 1984

LR 1

without locking some things in has served us well. It has served us well. It means that every part of the appropriations process is reviewed by this full Legislature at all times. Now I think that has some merit. As for the four-year proposal, the second part of Senator Warner's proposal, I have some concerns. I will tell you presently that I have not had many bills come and move through the process that had an A bill attached to them and the truth of the matter is that from a very personal point of view I am not too fearful of this four-year A bill process. However, it certainly does keep the perspective of the long term ramifications before this Legislature and I think that that in itself has some merit. It also will take away some of the craftiness that some of our more agile Legislature's members have been able to move. So I rise to tell this body that while I am not sympathetic with all of Senator Warner's proposal, I see some merit to the second part of it and I don't know exactly whether or not it can be changed or separated. I will look at that and at this point in time I am not anxious to move LR 1 but I am not so sure that it doesn't have some merit when you look at parts of the proposal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, do you wish to close on your amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I...

SPEAKER NICHOL: Excuse me, Senator Warner, I said amendment, I meant on your bill.

SENATOR WARNER: Right. I would move to...remove to advance the bill. I would remind you that the current Constitution was not changed when we went to annual sessions in that agencies are still required to, for example, submit a biannual budget. Now historically we don't look at it very much, at least not on the floor of the Legislature, but that concept was retained and I suspect in part, and I was here, in part with recognition that you need to look more than just twelve months ahead. We certainly recognized that in the revenue projections under the old system when we had the Board of Equalization functioning. All of you will recall that that specifically required the Board of Equalization to look for cash flow purposes two years in advance. They had